

### **REMARKS**

The Office rejects claims 1-13 in the subject application. Applicant amends claim 1 in this Response. Claims 1-13 (1 independent claims; 13 total claims) remain pending in the application.

The Office objects to the drawings indicating that Figures 12-21 should be designated by a Prior Art or Conventional Art legend. Applicant has amended Figures 12-21 to include a Conventional Art legend and submits Replacement Sheets for these amended Figures in this Response. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Support for the amendments may be found in the originally filed specification, claims, and figures. For example, the amendments to claim 1 can be found at paragraphs [0073] and [0074] and Figure 1 of the subject application (as published). No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTIONS**

#### **Kori and Hirano References**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 6-8, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kori (EP 0716545, published June 12, 1996, assignee is Sony Corporation) in view of Hirano (EP 0837601, published April 22, 1998, assignee is Hitachi, Ltd.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Kori discloses a video signal aspect ratio conversion apparatus with an aspect ratio converter, which converts the input aspect ratio of an input signal to a desired output aspect ratio.<sup>1</sup> The Examiner alleges that Kori teaches monitor information indicating a type of progressive scan monitor.<sup>2</sup> But Kori fails to disclose a conversion of the input signal to a progressive video scan signal, and further conversion of the aspect ratio of the progressive scan signal which is output to a second monitor (i.e., a progressive scan video monitor). As such, Kori fails to disclose an apparatus that can provide two different video output terminals to which two different video monitors can be connected.

**Accordingly, Kori in view of Hirano fails to teach, advise, or suggest “the converted interlaced scan video signal is output to the interlaced scan video output terminal and the converted progressive scan video signal is output to the progressive scan video output**

---

<sup>1</sup> Kori, Abstract and Figure 1.

**terminal, concurrently” as recited in claim 1 (and claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 10-13, which variously depend from claim 1).**

Hirano discloses a signal processing method for a format conversion on picture signals. An interlaced scanning picture signal S1 is converted into a progressive scanning picture signal SP, and a scaling processing on the picture signal is carried out (e.g., the aspect ratio is converted).<sup>3</sup> This is based on an input signal S1 and on the type of the picture output device.<sup>4</sup> Hirano further discloses that the type of image source is directly taped from the input picture signal S1 before the IP converter 1 converts the interlaced video signal SM into a progressive video signal SP. Hirano discloses that the progressive video signal SP is converted from an original interlaced video signal.<sup>5</sup>

**Accordingly, Kori in view of Hirano fails to teach, advise, or suggest “the converted interlaced scan video signal is output to the interlaced scan video output terminal and the converted progressive scan video signal is output to the progressive scan video output terminal, concurrently” as recited in claim 1 (and claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 10-13, which variously depend from claim 1).**

Furthermore, Kori discloses that a problem arises when a NTSC 4:3 television receives a wide screen 16:9, since the number of horizontal lines of a wide screen video signal do not correspond to the number of horizontal lines of the NTSC television. As a result, if a wide-screen video picture is displayed on an NTSC television, upper and lower portions of the video picture (as shown in Figure 16c of Kori) are blank. Also, if a 4:3 video picture is displayed on a 16:9 wide screen television, top and bottom portions of the video picture are cut off (as shown in Fig. 17d) or left and right portions are blank, as shown in Fig. 17e. These blank portions, according to Kori, are unappealing.<sup>6</sup> **Accordingly, an object of the Kori reference is to provide a video-signal aspect ratio conversion apparatus that allows a wide-screen picture to be transmitted to NTSC format without creating blank portions and without deforming the shape of the picture.**<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Office Action mailed November 4, 2005, page 3.

<sup>3</sup> Hirano, Abstract and Figure 1.

<sup>4</sup> Hirano, column 9, lines 37-41.

<sup>5</sup> Hirano, column 8, lines 19-38, and Figure 1.

<sup>6</sup> Kori, column 1, lines 32-55.

<sup>7</sup> Kori, column 2, lines 21-29.

But Hirano teaches away from Kori. Hirano focuses on a system for format conversion and scaling on a picture signal. In converting the format, Hirano teaches several format types, including normal mode, cinema mode, smooth wide, full mode, and zoom mode. These modes are shown in Figs. 19A-19F of Hirano. As can be seen in the figures, each mode either distorts the image or provides blank portions on the display. **Consequently, Hirano describes a system that produces what Kori is trying to avoid, namely, blank video portions and image distortion. Indeed, since Hirano teaches away from Kori, combining these references would make Kori inoperable for its intended use.**

Thus, Kori in view of Hirano fail to teach, advise, or suggest one or more missing claimed elements, and furthermore, teach away from each other, so that claims 1-3, 6-8, and 10-13 are patentable over these references.

#### **Kori, Hirano, and Fukuoka References**

The Examiner rejects claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kori in view of Hirano as applied to claims 1 and 3 and further in view of Fukuoka (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,086, issued September 30, 1997, assignee is Canon Kabushiki Kaisha). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Based upon the above discussion of claim 1 and the Kori and Hirano references, claims 4 and 5 (which variously depend from claim 1) are also patentable over Kori in view of Hirano as applied to claims 1 and 3 and further in view of Fukuoka.

#### **Kori, Hirano, and Monta References**

The Examiner rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kori in view of Hirano as applied to claims 3 and 7 and further in view of Monta (U.S. Patent No. 5,621,469, issued April 15, 1997, assignee is the Applicant). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Based upon the above discussion of claim 1 and the Kori and Hirano references, claim 9 (which variously depends from claim 1) is also patentable over Kori in view of Hirano as applied to claims 3 and 7 and further in view of Monta.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is thus requested. Applicant invites the Office to telephone the undersigned if he or she has any questions whatsoever regarding this Response or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2-3-06

By: S. Shahpar  
Shahpar Shahpar  
Reg. No. 45,875

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.  
400 East Van Buren  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202  
Phone: (602) 382-6306  
Fax: (602) 382-6070  
Email: [sshahpar@swlaw.com](mailto:sshahpar@swlaw.com)